arXiv:1612.07577v3 [math.DS] 9 Jan 2017

SHARED MATINGS IN V_2

MAGNUS ASPENBERG

Abstract. We give a new constructive method to prove existence of shared matings in the special class V_2 consisting of rational maps with a super-attracting 2-cycle (up to Möbius conjugacy). The proof does not use Thurston's Theorem on branched coverings on the Riemann sphere. The background to this paper is the master thesis of L. Pedersen [4], where one special shared mating was studied.

1. Introduction

The idea of mating was introduced by J. Hubbard and A. Douady to partially parameterize the space of rational maps (of degree 2 or higher) by pairs of polynomials of the same degree. Let us here first roughly explain the idea. More precise definitions follow. Take two polynomials $f_1(z) = z^2 + c_1$ and $f_2(z) = z^2 + c_2$, where c_1, c_2 belong to the Mandelbrot set $\mathcal{M}$. Suppose that they have locally connected Julia sets. Then try to glue their filled Julia sets together along their boundaries in reverse order. Under good circumstances one obtains a topological object which is homeomorphic to a sphere. If then the dynamics on this sphere can be realized by a rational map R of degree 2, then R is called the mating between f_1 and f_2. We will make a more precise statement about this later. A. Douady and J. Hubbard conjectured the following.

Problem. As long as c_1 and c_2 do not belong to conjugate limbs of the Mandelbrot set, then f_1 and f_2 are mateable.

For post-critically finite polynomials, the whole problem with mating in degree 2 has been settled by T. Lei, M. Rees and M. Shishikura, see [6] and [5]. A main ingredient of this result is Thurston's famous Theorem on branched coverings of the Riemann sphere. This paper is an attempt to introduce new techniques of performing a mating of two post-critically finite quadratic polynomials, without the use of Thurston's theorem. We will focus on a specific class of matings, so called shared matings, studied for instance in the master thesis project [4] by L. Pedersen. These shared matings are functions in the special class V_2, also studied by V. Timorin in [7], and [2] et al. We will use some results from [2], without however using any puzzle techniques. In [7] V. Timorin proved existence of matings in terms of laminations on the external boundary of the bifurcation locus of V_2, a results that partially covers our main result (Theorem 1.3). In fact, [2] also partially covers our result, since post-critically finite maps are not renormalizable. Shared matings in V_2 are also described in [3]. Hence the main result is already in the literature, but we use another approach.

1.1. **Definition of mating.** Consider two quadratic polynomials $f_1(z) = z^2 + c_1$ and $f_2(z) = z^2 + c_2$, with locally connected Julia sets J_j and where c_1, c_2 belong to the Mandelbrot set $\mathcal{M}$, but do not lay in conjugate limbs of $\mathcal{M}$. Let K_j be their filled Julia sets $j = 1, 2$. Then there is a conformal map

$$\Phi_j : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus K_j \mapsto \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}},$$

where $\mathbb{D}$ is the (open) unit disk. Since K_j is locally connected Φ_j^{-1} extends to $\partial\mathbb{D}$ continuously. We define *external rays*

$$R_j(t) = \Phi_j^{-1}(\{re^{it} : r > 1\}), \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, 2.$$

We now follow the definition according to Milnor, used for example in [1]. Let S^2 be the unit sphere in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}$. Identify each complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ containing K_i (dynamical plane of f_i), with the northern hemisphere $\mathbb{H}_+$ for $i = 1$ and southern hemisphere $\mathbb{H}_-$ for $i = 2$, via the gnomic projections,

$$\nu_1 : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{H}_+ \qquad \nu_2 : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{H}_-,$$

where $\nu_1(z) = (z, 1)/\sqrt{|z|^2 + 1}$ and $\nu_2(z) = (\bar{z}, -1)/\sqrt{|z|^2 + 1}$. This makes ν_2 equal to ν_1 composed with a 180 degree rotation around the x-axis.

It is now not hard to check that the ray $\nu_1(R_1(t))$ of angle t in the northern hemisphere land at the point $(e^{2\pi it}, 0)$ on the equator (the unit circle in the plane between the hemispheres). Similarly the ray $\nu_2(R_2(-t))$ on the southern hemisphere of angle $-t$ lands at the point $(e^{2\pi it}, 0)$ also. The functions $\nu_i \circ f_i \circ \nu_i^{-1}$ from one hemisphere onto itself are well defined. Moreover, if we approach the equator along the two rays with angle t and $-t$ respectively, both maps $\nu_1 \circ f_1 \circ \nu_1^{-1}$ and $\nu_2 \circ f_2 \circ \nu_2^{-1}$ are going to converge to the same map $(z, 0) \to (z^2, 0)$ on the equator. Hence we can glue the two maps together along the equator to form a well defined smooth map from S^2 onto itself. This map, denoted by $f_1 \uplus f_2$ is called the *formal mating* of f_1 and f_2.

Define the *ray equivalence relation* $\sim_r$ on S^2 to be the smallest equivalence relation such that the closure of the image $\nu_1(R_1(t))$, as well as the closure of $\nu_2(R_2(-t))$ lies in a single equivalence class.

The question whether the space $S^2/\sim_r$ is still a sphere is answered by Moore's Theorem.

Theorem 1.1 (R.L. Moore)**.** *Let $\sim$ be any topologically closed equivalence relation on S^2, with more than one equivalence class and with only connected equivalence classes. Then $S^2/\sim$ is homeomorphic to S^2 (via some homeomorphism h) if and only if each equivalence class is non separating. Moreover let $\pi : S^2 \to S^2/\sim$ denote the natural projection. In the positive case above we may choose the homeomorphism $h : S^2/\sim \to S^2$ such that the composite map $h \circ \pi$ is a uniform limit of homeomorphisms.*

Note that if c_1 and c_2 would belong to conjugate limbs of $\mathcal{M}$, then the α-fixed points α_1 and α_2 for f_1 and f_2 respectively would be landing points for external rays of conjugate angles; i.e. if $R_1(s)$ lands at α_1, then $R_2(-s)$ lands at α_2. Since each α-fixed point has at least two external rays landing at it, the above mentioned ray equivalence relation would separate the sphere. This makes matings between two such polynomials impossible.

Now we can define conformal mating or simply, mating as follows.

Definition 1.2. The two polynomials f_1 and f_2 are said *conformally mateable*, or just mateable, if there exist a rational map R and two semi-conjugacies $\psi_j : K_j \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ conformal on the interior of K_j, such that $\psi_1(K_1) \cup \psi_2(K_2) = \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ and

$$\forall (z, w) \in K_i \times K_j, \quad \psi_i(z) = \psi_j(w) \iff z \sim_r w.$$

The rational map R is called a *conformal mating*.

1.2. **The family V_2.** The family V_2 is a space of rational maps which have a super-attracting periodic point of order 2. Up to Möbius conjugacy, it is the family of rational maps

$$R_a(z) = \frac{a}{z^2 + 2z}, \qquad a \in \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \{0\}$$

We see that the critical points are $\{\infty, -1\}$. Every R_a has a super-attracting cycle $0 \mapsto \infty \mapsto 0$. We will study maps in this family for which the so called *free* critical point -1 is strictly pre-periodic and belongs to the Julia set. We will fix a such that R_a is sub-hyperbolic and sometimes suppress the index for the rest of the paper, writing $R = R_a$.

Let A_0 be the immediate basin of attraction for 0, A_∞ be the immediate basin of attraction for ∞. Let $\chi_0 : A_0 \mapsto \mathbb{D}$ and $\chi_\infty : A_\infty \mapsto \mathbb{D}$ be the corresponding Böttcher maps for these domains. Of course these sets depend on the parameter. However, unless needed we will not write out this dependence explicit.

In our specific situation, rational maps from the family V_2 are sometimes matings between the basilica polynomial $f_{-1}(z) = z^2 - 1$ and some other polynomial $f_c(z) = z^2 + c$, where c does not belong to the 1/2-limb of the Mandelbrot set. It is obvious that if R_a is a mating then one of the two mated polynomials has to be the basilica polynomial, since R_a has a super-attracting 2-cycle for each $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. We will consider matings where f_c is a so called Misiurewicz-Thurston polynomial; namely a polynomial where the critical point $z = 0$ is strictly pre-periodic. The idea is to prove that a sub-class of such polynomials are mateable with the basilica polynomial, by constructing the semi-conjugacy on a dense subset of the filled Julia sets, where the ray-equivalence relation is fulfilled automatically. After that we extend these semi-conjugacies and prove that the extensions are continuous. Finally, a technical lemma (Lemma 4.8) is a main part of proving that the semi-conjugacies obey the ray equivalence relation on the full filled Julia sets.

Let $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(\theta)$ be the external rays of angle θ for the map f_c and f_{-1} respectively. For a given Misiurewicz-Thurston polynomial f_c for which $z = 0$ is eventually mapped onto the landing point of the ray $\mathcal{R}_c(1/3)$, suppose that $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta)$ lands at c. Consider another Misiurewicz-Thurston polynomial $f_{c'}$, for which $\mathcal{R}_{c'}(\theta')$ lands on c' where $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta')$ lands on the same bi-accessible point in the basilica. We call f_c and $f_{c'}$ a *basilica-pair*. Clearly also $z = 0$ is eventually mapped onto $\mathcal{R}_{c'}(1/3)$ under $f_{c'}$. We have the following result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let f_c be a Misiurewicz-Thurston polynomial, such that the critical point $z = 0$ is eventually mapped onto the landing point of $\mathcal{R}_c(1/3)$, and suppose that $c \in \mathcal{M}$ does not belong to the 1/2-limb. Then f_c and f_{-1} are conformally mateable. Moreover, if $f_{c'}$ and f_c is a basilica-pair, then the mating R_a between f_c and f_{-1} is also a mating between $f_{c'}$ and f_{-1}.*

Such matings as R_a above are called *shared matings* meaning that they are matings between two different pairs of polynomials. We call K_{-1} and the filled Julia set for f_{-1}, and let $J(f_{-1}) = J_{-1}$ and $J(f_c) = J_c$ be the Julia sets for f_{-1} and f_c respectively.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Wolf Jung for useful comments.

2. Construction of ψ_+ on a dense subset of K_{-1}

We start in this section with partially defining a semi-conjugacy $\psi_+ : K_{-1} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$. Together with another semi-conjugacy $\psi_c : J_c \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ we prove that R_a is indeed a mating between f_{-1} and f_c. Since R_a in the end will be a shared mating, it will also be a mating between f_{-1} and $f_{c'}$ and hence there are semi-conjugacies $\psi_- : K_{-1} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ together with $\psi_{c'} : J_{c'} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ for this mating. Since the constructions of the semi-conjugacies ψ_+ and ψ_- are very similar, we will mainly focus on one of them. In Subsection 2.2 we will see more clearly why these two choices arise (the construction of ψ_c and $\psi_{c'}$ are inherited from these).

Recall that the basilica polynomial $f_{-1}(z) = z^2 - 1$ has a super-attracting cycle of order 2; $0 \mapsto -1 \mapsto 0$. Let $\phi_0 : B_0 \mapsto \mathbb{D}$ and $\phi_{-1} : B_{-1} \mapsto \mathbb{D}$ be the Böttcher maps of the basins B_0 and B_{-1} respectively, where B_0 contains $z = 0$ and B_{-1} contains $z = -1$. First, let ψ_+ be defined

on the B_0 as

$$\psi_+(z) = \chi_\infty^{-1} \circ \phi_0(z)$$

and similarly for B_{-1},

$$\psi_+(z) = \chi_0^{-1} \circ \phi_{-1}(z)$$

Since there is a fixed point $\alpha = \overline{B_0} \cap \overline{B_{-1}}$ and also a fixed point $p_\alpha = \overline{A_0} \cap \overline{A_\infty}$ we extend ψ_+ to have $\psi_+(\alpha) = p_\alpha$.

Now we can define ψ_+ by taking pre-images until we hit the critical point for R_a, where a is a specific parameter which depends on the map f_c. Suppose that the critical point $z = 0$ for $f_c(z)$ is strictly pre-periodic such that $f_c^m(0) = \mathcal{R}_c(1/3)$ for the least possible $m > 0$. Then R_a will also be critically strictly pre-periodic such that $R^m(-1) = p_\alpha$ for the least possible $m > 0$. Without specifying R_a more than this for the moment (the precise definition is made in Subsection 2.1), we can define ψ_+ by taking the first $m-1$ pre-images of $B_0 \cup \{\alpha\}$ because the map ψ_+ will be injective there. To see this, let

$$L_n = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n} f_{-1}^{-k}(B_0 \cup \{\alpha\}) \tag{1}$$

and suppose we already have defined a conjugacy ψ_+, mapping L_n onto its image $\psi_+(L_n)$, for some $n < m-1$. By pulling back L_n under f_{-1}, we get that $L_{n+1} \setminus L_n$ consists of finitely many new Fatou components (iterated pre-images of B_0) that are attached to the previous set L_n via a unique iterated pre-image of the fixed point α. The same is true for the map R_a; since $n < m-1$, the pre-image of the set $\psi_+(L_{n+1} \setminus L_n)$ under R_a consists of equally many Fatou components that are attached to $\psi_+(L_n)$ via a unique iterated pre-image of p_α. Clearly there is only one choice of ψ_+ that (continuously) conjugates L_{n+1} with its new image. We can continue pulling back until we hit the critical value, i.e. there is an injective conjugacy

$$\psi_+ : L_{m-1} \longrightarrow \bigcup_{n=0}^{m-1} R_a^{-n}(A_\infty \cup \{p_\alpha\}). \tag{2}$$

Now, the critical value of $R_a(-1) = -a$ must belong to $\psi_+(L_{m-1})$, but $-1 \notin \psi_+(L_{m-1})$. Let w_0 be defined by $\psi_+(w_0) = -a$. In the next step there will be two points (pre-images of w_0) say w_1 and w_2 which will forced to be mapped onto the same point, namely -1 under ψ_+. Since both w_1 and w_2 are bi-accessible, there are four disjoint bubbles, B_1, B_1', B_2, B_2', such that $\overline{B_1} \cap \overline{B_2} = w_1$ and $w_2 = \overline{B_1'} \cap \overline{B_2'}$. Let $f_{-1}(B_1) = f_{-1}(B_1') = C_1$ and $f_{-1}(B_2) = f_{-1}(B_2') = C_2$. Hence $\overline{C_1} \cap \overline{C_2} = w_0$. We may fix these bubbles $B_1, B_2, B_1', B_2', C_1, C_2$ by saying that C_1 has strictly lower generation than C_2 (which means that B_1 and B_1' also have lower generation than B_2 and B_2' respectively). Moreover, since C_1 has strictly lower generation than C_2 it means that B_1 and B_1' belong to L_0.

2.1. **Choosing the right R_a.** Given f_c we have to find a candidate rational function R_a that is the mating between f_{-1} and f_c. Suppose that $z = 0$ is the landing point of two rays $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_2)$ for f_c. By assumption f_c is strictly pre-periodic and there is a (least) $m > 0$ such that $f_c^m(0)$ is a landing point for the ray $\mathcal{R}_c(1/3)$. This means that $2^m\theta_1 \equiv 2^m\theta_2 \equiv 1/3 \pmod 1$. Since $z = 0$ is critical, $f_c(0)$ is the landing point of only one ray $\mathcal{R}_c(2\theta_1) = \mathcal{R}_c(2\theta_2)$, since $2\theta_1 \equiv 2\theta_2$.

We want to find a rational map in the family V_2 which has the property that the critical point -1 is strictly pre-periodic and $R^m(-1)$ is the (unique) fixed point where A_0 and A_∞ touch, and moreover such that the Fatou set for R_a in some sense has the same topology as the basilica with some identifications. To do this we need some fact about the parameter space of R_a.

Definition 2.1. A *parabubble* $\mathcal{B}$ is a simply connected component of parameters a for which $R_a^n(a) \in A_\infty$, for some fixed $n \geq 0$.

According to [2], there is a correspondence between the right half of the basilica and the set of parabubbles. More precisely, the set $K_{-1} \setminus \alpha$ is the union of two connected components. Let $\mathcal{B}_R$ be the component that contains $z = 0$. From Lemma 5.9 in [2] we see that for each bubble $B \in \mathcal{B}_R$, there is a corresponding parabubble P, which is simply connected, such that $a \in P$ if and only if $-a \in B$ (such parabubbles are called capture components).

Now suppose that w_0 is the point where the ray $\mathcal{R}_+(-2\theta_1)$ lands in the basilica (recall that $\mathcal{R}_+(-2\theta_2)$ is the same ray since $2\theta_1 \equiv 2\theta_2$). There are precisely two bubbles C_1 and C_2 which touch at w_0. We have before chosen these such that C_1 has lower generation than C_2. By Lemma 5.9 in [2] there are two corresponding parabubbles P and P' such that $a \in P$ implies that the critical value $-a \in \psi_+(C_1)$ and likewise, $a \in P'$ implies $-a \in \psi_+(C_2)$. In fact, P is the predecessor to P' (see definition after Proposition 5.10 in [2]) and hence P and P' touch at exactly one point, $a \in \partial P \cap \partial P'$. Now, Lemma 5.9 (III) shows that $-a \in \partial\psi_+(C_1) \cap \partial\psi_+(C_2)$. Clearly, R_a is a Misiurewicz-Thurston map with $R_a^m(-1) = p_\alpha$.

Fix this parameter a for the rest of the paper. We will mainly follow from a thorough study of the parameter space of V_2, together with the description given in [2] to inductively construct ψ_+. As seen before, it is clear that there is an injective conjugacy on L_{m-1} by (2). To continue this conjugacy by pulling back, the critical point -1 will then be an image of the *two* pre-images of the corresponding point in the basilica. Hence these two points glue together in the image in a certain orientation preserving way. The main point is that this gluing can be made in two ways.

2.2. **Two choices for the construction of ψ_+.** Write $R_a = R$, where a is chosen in the previous section. Since R is a degree 2 map the point -1 meets four disjoint bubbles ordered as $\{F_1, F_2, F_1', F_2'\}$ clockwise, which are mapped in pairs onto two bubbles G_1 and G_2. Since -1 is critical of order 2, R maps two opposite bubbles F_j and F_j' onto the same bubble, i.e. $R(F_1) = R(F_1') = G_1$ and $R(F_2) = R(F_2') = G_2$, where $G_1 \neq G_2$. Moreover, from the previous section, we have that R is strictly pre-periodic, such that $R^m(-1) = p_\alpha$. Since ψ_+ is a conjugacy on L_{m-1} we know that $\psi_+(C_1)$ and $\psi_+(C_2)$ are determined from the construction on L_{m-1} above. Let us say that $\psi_+(C_j) = G_j$, $j = 1, 2$. By the fact that B_1, B_1' belong to L_{m-1}, we may further assume that $\psi_+(B_1) = F_1$ and $\psi_+(B_1') = F_1'$. However, there is still some freedom in how to define $\psi_+(B_2)$ and $\psi_+(B_2')$. Either $\psi_+(B_2) = F_2$ or $\psi_-(B_2) = F_2'$ (for the latter choice we change the notation from ψ_+ to ψ_-). As we shall see these two choices represent the two semi-conjugacies for the basilica-pair f_c and $f_{c'}$, defined just before Theorem 1.3.

Let us for now fix one such choice, $\psi_+(B_2) = F_2$. No other choices can be made and we get a semi-conjugacy

$$\psi_+ : \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f_{-1}^{-n}(B_0 \cup \{\alpha\}) \longrightarrow \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} R_a^{-n}(A_\infty \cup \{p_\alpha\})$$

which is injective on all bubbles in the basilica but two-to-one at certain iterated pre-images of α. Hence the basilica is mapped under ψ_+ into the Riemann sphere with some identifications.

Since w_1 and w_2 are bi-accessible, there are pairs of external rays landing at them; let us say that $\mathcal{R}_+(\eta_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(\eta_1')$ land at w_1, and $\mathcal{R}_+(\eta_2)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(\eta_2')$ land at w_2. Since $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_2)$ land on $z = 0$ in J_c we may put $\eta_1 = -\theta_1$ and $\eta_2 = -\theta_2$. Suppose that $0 < \eta_2 < \eta_1 < \eta_1' < \eta_2' < 1$, so that the order is fixed. From the choice of ψ_+ it also gives a way of gluing together w_1 and w_2 under ψ_+. By the above construction we can see that the bubble pairs $B_1 \cup B_2$ and $B_1' \cup B_2'$ are mapped onto the four bubbles $F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_1' \cup F_2'$ in the written order, i.e. $\psi_+(B_i) = F_i$ and $\psi_+(B_i') = F_i'$, $i = 1, 2$. There are four different non-homotopic paths in



FIGURE 1. Julia set of R_3. The middle point is the critical point $z = -1$. It touches the four bubbles F_1, F_2, F_1', F_2'. In this picture we also have $A_0 = F_1$ which touches A_∞ at $z = 1$.

$\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus K_{-1}$ connecting w_1 with w_2. If we extend ψ_+ to one representative h of these paths (take e.g a leaf of the outside lamination) so that ψ_+ maps the full path including the points w_1 and w_2 onto -1 then we get

$$\psi_+(B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_1' \cup B_2' \cup \{w_1\} \cup \{w_2\} \cup h) = (F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_1' \cup F_2' \cup \{-1\})$$

It is clear that only one of the four paths can make ψ_+ satisfy the following additional condition: We demand that ψ_+ is the uniform limit of a sequence ψ_n of continuous functions on $B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_1' \cup B_2' \cup \{w_1\} \cup \{w_2\} \cup \{h\}$, such that the functions ψ_n are injective on $B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_1' \cup B_2' \cup \{w_1\} \cup \{w_2\}$ (so that the image of $h \cup \{w_1\} \cup \{w_2\}$ eventually collapses to a point). Hence in a sense the bubble pairs $B_1 \cup B_2$ and $B_1' \cup B_2'$ get glued together in a certain way, via the path h. Now fix this path h connecting w_1 and w_2.

A *bubble ray* in $\mathring{K}$ is a sequence of (distinct) Fatou components F_j such that $\overline{F_j} \cap \overline{F_{j+1}} = x_j$ is always a single point. A *bubble* is simply a Fatou component (either from R_a or f_{-1}). We also define the *axis* of a bubble ray $\mathcal{B} = \{F_k\}$ as the union $\cup \gamma_k$ of where each γ_k is the union of two internal rays in F_k which land on x_k and x_{k-1} (hence γ_k is a curve inside F_k connecting x_{k-1} with x_k). Parameterizing the axis of $\mathcal{B}$ by an injective function $\gamma(t)$, where $t \in [0, \infty)$ with the property that if $\gamma(t_1) \in F_k$ and $\gamma(t_2) \in F_{k+1}$ then necessarily $t_1 < t_2$, we get a natural way of defining *right* and *left* of the axis for points in a neighbourhood of the axis if we go along the axis with increasing t for this parameterization. Take a small closed ball B around some $x_j = \overline{F_j} \cap \overline{F_{j+1}}$ such that B only intersects the axis in $\overline{F_j} \cup \overline{F_{j+1}}$. Then the set $B \setminus (\overline{F_j} \cup \overline{F_{j+1}})$ consists of two disjoint sets L and R. We define L and R as follows. Let x_1 be the point $\partial B \cap \gamma_{k-1}$ and x_2 the point $\partial B \cap \gamma_k$ (these points are unique if B is sufficiently small). Take any point y on the boundary of B different from x_1 and x_2. If the triple $\{x_1, x_2, y\}$ forms a



FIGURE 2. The path h connects w_1 with w_2, in this picture such that h lands on the same side as the external rays with angle $\eta_1 = 5/12$ and $\eta_2 = 11/12$ respectively. The two other angle pairs are pullbacks of the angle pair $(5/12, 11/12)$ corresponding to the outside lamination. The bubbles B_1, B_2, B_1', B_2' are also indicated. They get mapped onto F_1, F_2, F_1', F_2' for the mating, which is R_3 in this picture.

triangle where the corners in this order go counter clockwise we say that $y \in L$ and if the order is clockwise we say that $y \in R$. If an external ray lands at x_j then we say that it lands *on the left side of* x_j if the ray intersects L and not R and vice versa for any sufficiently small ball B.

It is now easy to see that the path h connecting w_1 and w_2 lands at the same side of w_j as the ray of angle η_j does, $j = 1, 2$. If we consider the other choice for the semi-conjugacy, where $\psi_-(B_2) = F_2'$ instead, corresponding to the shared mating between $f_{c'}$ and f_{-1} (where f_c and $f_{c'}$ is a basilica-pair), we get that h lands on the same side of w_j as the ray of angle η_j' does, $j = 1, 2$. Hence the path h would still connect w_1 and w_2 but from different *sides*. Note that $f_{c'}$ has two rays $\mathcal{R}_{c'}(\theta_1')$ and $\mathcal{R}_{c'}(\theta_2')$ landing on the critical point $z = 0$, whereas for f_c these rays are $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_2)$. We will not further consider the mating with $f_{c'}$, since the construction for f_c is completely analogous.

2.3. **Laminations for the basilica.** We say that $L_{\mathcal{O}}$ is the (outside) lamination in S^1 defined by connecting the rays θ_1 with θ_2 (or θ_1' and θ_2' if considering the other shared mating), and taking pre-images under angle doubling. From the previous section, each leaf in $L_{\mathcal{O}}$ corresponds to an identification of two points in the basilica in the following way: First we say that $\theta \sim_{L_{\mathcal{O}}} \theta'$ if θ and θ' belong to the same leaf in $L_{\mathcal{O}}$. Suppose that the two rays $\mathcal{R}_+(\theta)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(\theta')$ land at two points w and w' respectively. Then $\psi_+(w) = \psi_+(w')$ if $\theta \sim_{L_{\mathcal{O}}} \theta'$. The converse is not true. Each w, which is a landing point of a ray with angle θ belonging to some leaf of $L_{\mathcal{O}}$, has to be bi-accessible. Hence there are two angles θ and θ_1 such that the rays $\mathcal{R}_+(\theta)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(\theta_1)$ land at the same point w. Let $\sim_{Biac}$ be the equivalence relation such that $\theta \sim_{Biac} \theta_1$ if and only if $\mathcal{R}_+(\theta)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(\theta_1)$ land at the same point. Clearly this equivalence relation generates in the obvious way the "ordinary" basilica lamination.

3. Construction of ψ_c on a dense subset of $J(f_c)$

We begin with defining ψ_2 which we call ψ_c on a dense subset of the Julia set of $f_c(z) = z^2+c$. After that we will extend ψ_c to the full Julia set. Since f_c is a Misiurewicz-Thurston map, c is a landing point of an external ray $\mathcal{R}_c(\beta)$ of a strictly pre-periodic angle $\beta = p/q$. We have chosen it such that $\beta 2^{m-1} = 1/3$ for some $m > 0$. For example if $f_c(z) = z^2 + i$ we have that $\beta = 1/6$. Let θ_1 and θ_2 be the angles of the external rays landing on the critical point $z = 0$.

3.1. Construction of the semiconjugacy on a dense subset of the Julia set.

Let

$$E = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f_c^{-n}(0).$$

Since the critical value is uni-accessible all points in E are bi-accessible. Recall that the ray $\mathcal{R}_c(2\theta_1) = \mathcal{R}_c(2\theta_2)$ lands on c and that the rays $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_2)$ land at 0. The corresponding rays $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_2)$ for the basilica land on two distinct bi-accessible points w_1 and w_2. From the previous section we know that $\psi_+(w_1) = \psi_+(w_2)$ and hence it is natural to define

$$\psi_c(0) = \psi_+(w_1) = \psi_+(w_2).$$

Moreover, this directly makes $z = 0 \in J(f_i)$ ray equivalent to w_1 and w_2. We want to extend ψ_i to E, by taking pre-images.

Now, w_1 and w_2 have two pre-images each under f_{-1}. Let us denote these pre-images by $w_{11}, w_{12}, w_{21}, w_{22}$. They are identified in pairs under ψ_+ according to the lamination $L_{\mathcal{O}}$. Suppose that $\psi_+(w_{12}) = \psi_+(w_{11})$ and $\psi_+(w_{21}) = \psi_+(w_{22})$ and let z_1 and z_2 be the pre-images to 0 under f_c. The ray-pairs $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_{j1})$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_{j2})$ landing on z_j correspond to a ray pair $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_{j1})$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_{j2})$ landing on w_{j1} and w_{j2} respectively, for $j = 1, 2$. There is only one natural way to define $\psi_c(z_1)$ in order to preserve the ray equivalence relation between the pre-images, namely

$$\psi_c(z_1) = \psi_+(w_{11}) = \psi_+(w_{12}) \tag{3}$$

$$\psi_c(z_2) = \psi_+(w_{21}) = \psi_+(w_{22}). \tag{4}$$

Continuing in the same manner we obtain a map ψ_c defined on E. If we put

$$E' = E \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{m} f_c^n(0)$$

then we easily to extend ψ_c to E' via the map ψ_+. Every point z in the forward orbit of 0 has landing angles θ for which the landing point w of the ray $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta)$ is a bi-accessible point. Since $\psi_+(w)$ is well defined from before, we can define ψ_c on these points by letting

$$\psi_c(z) = \psi_+(w).$$

Let p_1 be the landing point of the ray $\mathcal{R}_c(1/3)$ and p_2 the landing point of the ray $\mathcal{R}_c(2/3)$. To fix the ideas, let us assume that the critical point $z = 0$ is mapped under f_c onto p_1 *before* p_2, meaning that $f_c^{n_j}(0) = p_j$ for the least possible n_j, $j = 1, 2$ then $n_1 < n_2$. Since the point $p_\alpha = R^m(-1)$ is a fixed point, i.e. $R(p_\alpha) = p_\alpha$, we have to have

$$\psi_c(p_1) = \psi_c(p_2) = p_\alpha.$$

From the construction we see that if $z \in E'$ and $w \in \cup_{n=0}^{\infty} f_{-1}^{-n}(\alpha)$ (i.e. w is bi-accessible) then $z \sim_r w$ if and only if $\psi_c(z) = \psi_+(w)$. Moreover, it also follows that if $w_1, w_2 \in L$ and $w_1 \in \partial\mathcal{R}_+(\theta)$, $w_2 \in \partial\mathcal{R}_+(\theta')$ where $\theta \sim_{L_{\mathcal{O}}} \theta'$ then $w_1 \sim_r w_2$.

We no extend ψ_c to

$$D = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f_c^{-n}(p_1).$$

Note that $E' \subset D$, so we will concentrate on $D \setminus E'$. Since the critical point $z = 0$ is mapped under f_c onto p_1 *before* p_2, one of the two pre-images of p_1 is equal to $f_c^{m-1}(0)$, which has to be the landing point of the ray $\mathcal{R}_c(1/6)$. Now, p_2 has two pre-images, namely p_1 and another one, say q, which is uni-accessible and has to be the landing point of the ray $\mathcal{R}_c(5/6)$. The ray $\mathcal{R}_+(-5/6)$ is bi-accessible and lands on some point r, so $\psi_+(r)$ is well defined from before. Thus define

$$\psi_c(q) = \psi_+(r).$$

Note that we have already set $\psi_c(f_c^{m-1}(0)) = \psi_+(r)$ from before. Hence we have defined ψ_c on the set $U_1 = f_c^{-1}(p_1) \cup f_c^{-1}(p_2)$. Now we take pre-images. Let us proceed inductively. Note that all points on $D \setminus E'$ are uni-accessible. Suppose we have constructed ψ_c on U_{k-1} where

$$U_k = \cup_{j=0}^{k} f_c^{-j}(p_1) \cup f_c^{-j}(p_2).$$

If $k < m$ it means that the set U_k does not contain the critical point. Every point q_j in $U_k \setminus U_{k-1}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n_k$, (where $n_k = 2^k$ if $k < m$ and $n_k = 2^k - 2^{k-m}$ if $k \geq m$) is landing point of a ray $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_j)$, where θ_j is a pre-image of $1/3$ or $2/3$ under angle doubling. It can easily be seen (by induction for example) that the corresponding set Θ_k of angles θ_j for the points q_j has the property that they can be ordered in pairs (θ_j, θ_j') such that $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_j)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_j')$ both land on the same bi-accessible point r_j in the basilica. This means that we have to define

$$\psi_c(q_j) = \psi_c(q_j') = \psi_+(r_j), \tag{5}$$

where q_j' is the landing point of the ray $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_j')$.

We recall that there are two rays $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_2)$ landing on $z = 0$ and where $2\theta_1 \equiv 2\theta_2$, i.e. $\mathcal{R}_c(2\theta_1) = \mathcal{R}_c(2\theta_2)$ which lands on c. Hence the angle-pairs in Θ_k which give the identification (5) give rise to more identifications on the set E, i.e. the iterated pre-images of the critical point, as described above.

We have constructed ψ_c via ψ_+ on the full set D. Note also that from the construction we have immediately that two points $z, w \in D$ are ray-equivalent if and only if $\psi_c(z) = \psi_c(w)$. Put

$$\mathcal{B}iac = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f_{-1}^{-n}(\alpha),$$

i.e. $\mathcal{B}iac$ is the set of all bi-accessible points in the basilica. Then for any $z \in D$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}iac$ we have that $z \sim_r w$ if and only if $\psi_c(z) = \psi_+(w)$.

Hence we now have two semi-conjugacies which obey the ray-equivalence relation on a dense subsets $\mathcal{B}iac \subset J(f_{-1})$ and $D \subset J(f_c)$. We now want to extend these functions to the full filled Julia sets.

4. Extension of ψ_+ and ψ_c

From the standard theory of iteration of critically finite rational maps, there exists an expanding hyperbolic metric outside the post-critical set, if it consists of at least 3 points (which is the case for R_a in this paper). In fact there is an orbifold metric $\varphi(z)$, and some $\Lambda > 1$ such that for any $z \in \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus P(R)$ we have

$$\varphi(R(z))|R'(z)| \geq \Lambda \varphi(z).$$

As a consequence of this we get

Lemma 4.1. *There exists constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that for any connected compact set $E \subset \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus P(R)$ we have that if F is any component of $R^{-n}(E)$ then*

$$diam(F) \leq C\lambda^n.$$

This means that the diameter of iterated pre-images of bubbles must tend to zero.

Definition 4.2. The *generation* of a bubble B (for the basilica) is the smallest integer $m \geq 0$ such that $f_{-1}(B) = B_0$. For the rational map R_a it is the smallest integer $m \geq 0$ such that $R_a^m(B) = A_0$. The generation of a union of bubbles is the smallest generation of a bubble in this union.

We now have a direct consequence of Lemma 4.1 we have:

Corollary 4.3. *There exist constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that if B is any bubble for R_a, then*

$$diam(B) \leq c\lambda^{gen(B)},$$

where $gen(B)$ is the generation of the bubble. Moreover, every bubble-ray must land at a single point.

Lemma 4.4. *Let B be a bubble of the basilica. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist only finitely many components U of $K_{-1} \setminus B$ for which $\psi_+(U)$ has diameter $diam(U) \geq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Every such component $\psi_+(U)$ is a bubble-ray. Let $gen(U)$ be the lowest generation among the bubbles in this bubble-ray. Then it is clear that for any $K < \infty$ there are only finitely many components U such that $\psi_+(U)$ has $gen(U) \leq K$. But since the diameter of bubbles tend to zero exponentially with the generation, according to the above Corollary, we get that also the sum of diameters of the bubbles in $\psi_+(U)$ tend to zero with the generation. This proves the lemma. □

We also need the following.

Lemma 4.5. *For the rational map R_a, we cannot have an infinite bubble ray landing at p_α.*

Proof. Suppose that there is a infinite bubble ray $\mathcal{B}$ landing at p_α (the fixed point between A_∞ and A_0). If $\mathcal{B}$ is periodic the result follows from Lemma 6.2 in [2]. If $\mathcal{B}$ is not periodic it means that all its forward images also have to land at p_α. Hence there are infinitely many bubble rays $\mathcal{B}_k$ landing at p_α. This we claim is impossible.

Take a finite bubble ray $\mathcal{B}_0$ such that its last bubble B of highest generation belongs to a ball $B(p_\alpha, r)$ of radius $r > 0$ around p_α. Suppose moreover that $r > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small so that inside this ball there is an (conformal) inverse branch of R. Let $\mathcal{B}_k = R^{-k}(\mathcal{B}_0)$, where we use the inverse branch of R in the neighbourhood $B(p_\alpha, r)$. Since there are only finitely many bubbles of any fixed generation there is at least one finite bubble ray $\mathcal{B}'_k$ that is contained in infinitely many bubble rays $\mathcal{B}_k$, $k > k'$. Take such $\mathcal{B}'_k$. Then there is some $m > 0$ such that $R^{-m}(\mathcal{B}'_k)$ contains $\mathcal{B}'_k$. In other words, $\mathcal{B}_{k'+m}$ is an extension of $\mathcal{B}'_k$. Repeating this we see that the bubble rays $\mathcal{B}_{ml+k'}$ is an increasing sequence of finite bubble rays. The union of all these bubble rays is an infinite bubble ray $\mathcal{B}_\infty$ that has to land at p_α, since this point is repelling. Moreover, $R^m(\mathcal{B}_\infty) = \mathcal{B}_\infty$, so it is periodic. Now apply Lemma 6.2 in [2] again to reach a contradiction.

□

As a corollary, the lemma shows that an infinite bubble ray $\mathcal{B}$ cannot land on a touching point between two bubbles for R_a. These points are precisely the images of the bi-accessible points under ψ_+.

These lemmas enables us to extend ψ_+ and ψ_i to the filled in Julia sets.

Firstly, since the map R_a is sub hyperbolic, its Julia set is locally connected and hence we may extend ψ_+ continuously to the closure of each bubble in K_{-1}.

Definition 4.6. A *tip* of the Julia set for the basilica is a point $w \in J(f_{-1})$ which does not belong to any bubble.

If $z \in K_{-1}$ is a tip of a bubble-ray $\mathcal{B}$, i.e. $\mathcal{B}$ consists of bubbles B_n where $dist(z, B_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, then put

$$\psi_+(z) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi_+(B_n).$$

By Corollary 4.3 ψ_+ is well defined.

We now prove that ψ_+ is continuous.

Lemma 4.7. *The function ψ_+ is continuous.*

Proof. We have to prove that if $w_k \to w$, $w_k \in K_{-1}$, then $\psi_+(w_k) \to \psi_+(w)$. Suppose that w belongs to the closure of a minimal bubble-ray $\mathcal{B} = \{B_k\}_{k=0}^N$, starting at B_0. Hence N is finite if w belongs to a boundary of a bubble and infinite if w belongs to a tip. Let $\mathcal{U}_k$ be the minimal bubble-ray, whose closure contains w_k. Let G_k be the (unique) bubble of maximal generation such that $G_k \subset \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{U}_k$. Set

$$\mathcal{G}_k = ((\mathcal{U}_k \cup \mathcal{B}) \setminus (\mathcal{U}_k \cap \mathcal{B})) \cup G_k.$$

Note that $w, w_k \in \overline{\mathcal{G}_k}$ for all k. We divide the proof in two cases.

Case 1: $gen(\mathcal{B}) = \infty$. By the hyperbolicity of f_{-1} this means that $\mathcal{G}_k$ has to decrease to a point, as $k \to \infty$, since $gen(\mathcal{G}_k) \to \infty$. Obviously, also $gen(\psi(\mathcal{G}_k)) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. But this means that, by Corollary 4.3, also $diam(\psi_+(\mathcal{G}_k)) \to 0$. Since both w_k and w belong to the closure of $\mathcal{G}_k$, we have immediately that $\psi_+(w_k) \to \psi_+(w)$.

Case 2: $gen(\mathcal{B}) < \infty$. Thus w belongs to the closure of a bubble, say $B \subset \mathcal{B}$. If $\mathcal{G}_k$ eventually becomes equal to B then it means that w_k eventually belongs to the closure of B and the lemma follows from the construction of ψ_+, which is continuous on the closure of bubbles.

If $\mathcal{G}_k$ does not eventually become equal to B, let $p_k \in \overline{B}$ be the the touching point between B and another bubble in $\mathcal{G}_k$ attached to B. Clearly $p_k \to w$ as $k \to \infty$.

If $p_k = w$ for all sufficiently large k, that means that w is an iterated pre-image of α. Hence $w = \overline{B} \cap \overline{B'}$ where $B' \subset \mathcal{G}_k$ is another bubble of higher generation than B. Write $\mathcal{C}_k = \mathcal{G}_k \setminus (B \cup B')$. If $\mathcal{C}_k = \emptyset$ for sufficiently large k then it means that $w_k \in \partial B'$ and $\psi_+(w_k) \to \psi_+(w)$ by the continuity on the boundary of bubbles. If $\mathcal{C}_k \neq \emptyset$ for arbitrarily large k then suppose for simplicity that $\mathcal{C}_k \neq \emptyset$ for all k by passing to a suitable subsequence. Let q_k be the touching point between $\mathcal{C}_k$ and B'. Clearly, $gen(\mathcal{C}_k) \to \infty$ and $q_k \to w$. Hence $diam(\psi_+(\mathcal{C}_k)) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ by Corollary 4.3. Let γ_k be the smallest closed arc along the boundary of B' between q_k and w. Since $q_k \to w$, we have that the set $\mathcal{C}_k \cup \gamma_k$ is a connected set whose diameter tends to zero, and hence the set is true for $\psi_+(\mathcal{C}_k \cup \gamma_k)$. Since both w_k and w belong to the closure of this set it follows that $\psi_+(w_k) \to \psi_+(w)$.

Finally, we consider the case $p_k \neq w$ for all k (by possibly passing to a suitable subsequence). Similar to the above case, let $\mathcal{C}_k = \mathcal{G}_k \setminus B$ and let γ_k be the smallest arc along the boundary of B connecting w with p_k. Since the generation of $\mathcal{C}_k$ must tend to infinity, we have that $diam(\mathcal{C}_k) \to 0$ and hence also $diam(\psi_+(\mathcal{C}_k)) \to 0$. Again $\mathcal{C}_k \cup \gamma_k$ is a connected set whose diameter tends to zero as $k \to \infty$ and the same is true for $\psi_+(\mathcal{C}_k \cup \gamma_k)$. Since w_k belongs to the closure of $\mathcal{C}_k \cup \gamma_k$ we must have $\psi_+(w_k) \to \psi_+(w)$, as $k \to \infty$. □

In order to extend ψ_c to the full Julia set we need first a lemma. Recall that $E = \cup_{n=0}^{\infty} f_c^{-n}(0)$. The points in E are bi-accessible and the set E is dense in the Julia set. Denote the full set of bi-accessible points in the Julia set by $\mathcal{B}iac$, (so $E \subset \mathcal{B}iac$). Let

$$\Theta = \{(\theta, \theta') : \text{ There exist } z \in E, \text{ such that } \mathcal{R}_c(\theta) \text{ and } \mathcal{R}_c(\theta') \text{ land on } z\}$$

be the set of angle pairs landing at points in E. We call the pair (θ, θ') a *ray pair* for the point z. More generally, we say that the angle α is a landing angle for z if the ray $\mathcal{R}_c(\alpha)$ lands at z. If $z \in J(f_c)$ is a multiply accessible point in $J(f_c)$ with landing angles $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p)$, then we say that the angles in (α_j, α_{j+1}) are *adjacent* if there is no angle α_k between them.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $w \in J(f_c)$ be a multiply accessible point with landing angles $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p)$. Put $\alpha_{p+1} = \alpha_1$. Then for each adjacent angle pair (α_j, α_{j+1}), $j = 1, \ldots, p$ there is a sequence $w_k \to w$, $w_k \in E$ such that the ray pairs (θ_k, θ_k') converge to (α_j, α_{j+1}), i.e. $\theta_k \to \alpha_j$ and $\theta_k' \to \alpha_{j+1}$, as $k \to \infty$.*

Proof. Suppose the statement of the lemma is not true. That the leaves (α_j, α_{j+1}) form a geodesic polygon in the unit disk. First we construct a set of angles A by deleting all arcs $(\theta, \theta') \in \Theta$ apart from the arcs (α_j, α_{j+1}) (of course) from the unit circle S^1. Since each arc is open and its complement non-empty the intersection of the complement all such (countable) arcs is non empty closed set in S^1. We will study the resulting set A of angles and their corresponding external rays which land on $J(f_c)$.

Since the ray-pairs (θ, θ') are partially ordered by inclusion, and since there is an upper bound for each partial ordering (one of the arcs (α_j, α_{j+1})) there has to be a maximal element in each ordering (by Zorn's Lemma); i.e. there has to be a *maximal* ray pair $(\theta, \theta') \in A$. Note however, that the ray pair (θ, θ') may not belong to Θ anymore. However the rays $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta)$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta')$ must land on the same point and that this point is (at least) bi-accessible. Since the geodesic polygon formed by the angles $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p)$ partition the unit circle into at least 2 intervals, and since Θ is dense, the set of maximal elements has to be at least 2. Now consider the corresponding points

$$B = \{z \in J(f_c) : \text{ There exist an angle } \theta \in A \text{ such that the ray } \mathcal{R}_c(\theta) \text{ lands at } z \in J(f_c)\}.$$

Clearly, B is a closed connected subset of the Julia set. Note that if B is trivial, i.e. consists of only one single point $w \in J(f_c)$, then the lemma follows, since this would mean that the maximal ray pairs are precisely the arcs (α_j, α_{j+1}). Hence we suppose to reach a contradiction, that B is not just a single point.

We want to prove that B in fact contains an iterated pre-image of the critical point, i.e. there is a $z \in E \cap B$. Take two points $a, b \in B$ which have the property that they are (at least) bi-accessible. We may choose them such that there are maximal ray pairs (θ_a, θ_a') and (θ_b, θ_b') with angles in A, such that $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_a)$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_a')$ land at a and $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_b), R_c(\theta_b')$ land at b. If any of them, say a, is more than bi-accessible, i.e. there is a larger arc (θ_1, θ_1') whose rays land at a and such that $(\theta_a, \theta_a') \subset (\theta_1, \theta_1')$, then consider the largest such arc and call it (θ_1, θ_1') for a and correspondingly (θ_2, θ_2') for b. Now take an equipotential Q together with the rays $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_1), \mathcal{R}_c(\theta_1'), \mathcal{R}_c(\theta_2), \mathcal{R}_c(\theta_2')$. These rays together with Q cut out three (bounded) puzzle pieces; choose the one which meets both a and b and call it P. By non-normality, there is an N such that $f_c^N(P)$ covers the whole Julia set and hence we must also have $f_c^N(J(f_c) \cap P) = J(f_c)$.

Since B is connected and $J(f_c)$ is uniquely path-connected there is a path $\gamma \subset B$ which connects a and b. If $f_c^j(\gamma)$ does not meet the critical point for any $j \leq N$ then the map f_c^N is univalent in a neighbourhood of γ, or $f_c^N(\gamma)$ creates a loop in $J(f_c)$ which is impossible (since $J(f_C)$ is uniquely path connected). The set $J(f_c) \setminus f_c^N(\gamma)$ is a disjoint union disjoint connected components (since the endpoints $f_c^N(a)$ and $f_c^N(b)$ are still at least bi-accessible). Let X be

one of them meeting $f_c^N(\gamma)$ at $f_c^N(a)$ or $f_c^N(b)$, and take some $y \in X$, $y \neq f_c^N(a), y \neq f_c^N(b)$. Let $x \in P \setminus \gamma$ be a pre-image inside P. Then there is a path $\gamma' \subset J(f_c)$ connecting x with the closest point $x' \in \gamma$. Since f_c^N is univalent on γ there is only one pre-image to $f_c^N(x')$ in γ, namely x' (of course). We have to have $x' \neq a, b$. To see this, suppose that $x' = a$ for instance. Then we claim that γ' would not lay inside P. The rays $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta_1), \mathcal{R}_c(\theta_1')$, by the definition of the angles θ_1, θ_1', cut of all but one of the components of $J(f_c) \setminus \{a\}$. If $x' = a$ then γ' would not belong to P. Hence $x' \neq a$. The argument is similar for b of course. So we have $x' \neq a, b$.

Moreover, $f_c^N(x')$ cannot be $f_c^N(a)$ or $f_c^N(b)$ since these points are images of a and b resp. But this means that $f_c^N(x')$ is connected to $f_c^N(x)$ with a path intersecting $f_c^N(\gamma)$, where this intersection itself is a non-trivial path (i.e. consists of more than one point). Any point in $f_c^N(\gamma)$ inside a small neighbourhood of $f_c^N(x')$ has to have two pre-images; one pre-image in γ' which is disjoint from γ and also one pre-image in γ. Both pre-images can be chosen arbitrarily close to x' by continuity of f_c^N. But this contradicts the fact that f_c^N is univalent in a neighbourhood of γ. Hence there has to be a critical point on $f_c^j(\gamma)$ for some $j \leq N$ and hence there has to be a point in γ (not equal to a or b) that belong to E. The lemma is thereby proved.

□

We now extend ψ_c as follows. Let $z_k \to z$, as $k \to \infty$, where $z \in J(f_c)$ and $z_k \in E$. By the previous section $\psi_c(z_k)$ is well defined. We want to put

$$\psi_c(z) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \psi_c(z_k).$$

However, we have to show that this is independent of the choice of the sequence $z_k \in E$. First we note that if z is uni-accessible then there is one single angle θ for which the ray $\mathcal{R}_c(\theta)$ lands at z. If $z_k \to z$ then all the angles of the rays landing at z_k have to converge to θ. Suppose that the rays $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_k)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_k')$ land at z_k. Since $\theta_k, \theta_k' \to \theta$ as $k \to \infty$ we get immediately that $\psi_c(z_k) \to \psi_c(z)$ by the continuity of ψ_+.

Let us assume that z is multiply accessible. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p$ be the angles of the rays landing at z. By lemma 4.8 there exist a sequence $z_{k,j} \in E$ such that the angles $(\theta_{k,j}, \theta_{k,j}') \to (\alpha_j, \alpha_{j+1})$ for $j = 1, \ldots, p-1$. Let $w_{k,j}$ be the landing point of the ray $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_{k,j})$ and $w_{k,j}'$ the landing point of the ray $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_{k,j}')$. By the construction of ψ_+ we know that $\psi_+(w_{k,j}) = \psi_+(w_{k,j}')$. Define

$$\psi_c(z) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \psi_+(w_{k,j}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \psi_+(w_{k,j}'). \tag{6}$$

Now, repeat this argument with j replaced by $j+1$, starting with $j = 1$. This makes ψ_c well defined, and independent of the choice of $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ above. Since ψ_c is constructed via ψ_+, the function ψ_c is continuous.

5. Ray equivalence and proof of Theorem 1.3

The semi-conjugacies ψ_+ and ψ_c are now constructed. What remains is to prove that they satisfy the ray equivalence relation.

Put $\psi_+ = \psi_1$ and $\psi_c = \psi_2$. In this section we show that the maps ψ_+ and ψ_c satisfy the ray equivalence relation:

$$\psi_j(w) = \psi_k(z) \text{ if and only if } z \sim_r w, \tag{7}$$

$j, k = 1, 2$.

By construction, (7) is satisfied if $z \in E$, $k = 2$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}iac_+$, $j = 1$, where $\mathcal{B}iac_+$ is the set of bi-accessible points in the basilica. Hence in the cases below we always suppose that any $z \in J(f_c)$ does not belong to E and any $w \in J(f_{-1})$ is not bi-accessible.

Moreover, the construction of ψ_+ and ψ_c almost immediately gives the first implication; $z \sim_r w$ implies $\psi_j(w) = \psi_k(z)$ for any $j, k = 1, 2$. In case 1 below we outline the arguments for $j = k = 1$. For the other cases, when not $j = k = 1$, we leave the details to the reader. The other implications also follow from the construction, but as obvious.

Case 1. $j = k = 1$ We first suppose that $w_1 \sim_r w_2$ (and both points lay in the basilica) and there are rays $\mathcal{R}_+(t_1)$ which land on w_1 and $\mathcal{R}_+(t_2)$ which lands at w_2 such that $\mathcal{R}_c(-t_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(-t_2)$ land at the same point $z \in J(f_c)$. The fact that $\psi_+(w_1) = \psi_+(w_2)$ follows from (6). If there is a larger chain of rays connecting w_1 with w_2 the same argument applies finitely many times.

Now suppose $\psi_+(w_1) = \psi_+(w_2)$ and suppose that w_1 and w_2 are not ray equivalent to reach a contradiction. Let $\mathcal{R}_+(t_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(t_2)$ be two rays landing at w_1 and w_2 respectively. Consider the rays $\mathcal{R}_c(-t_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(-t_2)$ and suppose they land at two distinct points $z_1 \in J_c$ and $z_2 \in J_c$ respectively. Let $A = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p\}$ and $B = \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_q\}$ be the angles for the rays landing at z_1 and z_2 respectively, and so $-t_1 \in A$ and $-t_2 \in B$. It is clear that some adjacent ray pair (α, α') in A has to contain all angles in B unless z_1 is uni-accessible, in which case we put $\alpha' = \alpha + 1$ (regarding S^1 as $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$). We may assume that at least one of w_1 or w_2 is a tip in the basilica, since otherwise $\psi_+(w_1) = \psi_+(w_2)$ only at certain pre-images of the α-fixed point and these points are ray equivalent by construction. Let z be a point in the basilica and let $\mathcal{B}(t)$ be the (possibly finite) bubble ray in the basilica which, in the finite case, ends at a bubble containing z on its boundary where $\mathcal{R}_+(t)$ lands on z or, in the infinite case, lands at the landing point of $\mathcal{R}_+(t)$. In the finite case we also say that $\mathcal{B}(t)$ lands at z. In the infinite case clearly z is a tip. Consider the bubble rays $\mathcal{B}_R(-\alpha') = \psi_+(\mathcal{B}(-\alpha)), \mathcal{B}_R(-\alpha') = \psi_+(\mathcal{B}(-\alpha'))$ and $\mathcal{B}_R(-\beta) = \psi_+(\mathcal{B}(-\beta))$, where we may suppose that the latter is infinite for some $\beta \in B$.

By Lemma 4.8 there are ray-pairs (θ_k, θ_k') that converges to (α, α'). Let us suppose that $\alpha < \theta_k < \theta_k' < \alpha'$ and that $\alpha < \beta < \alpha'$. For some k_0 we have to have $\theta_k < \beta < \theta_k'$ for all $k \geq k_0$. Suppose that $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_k)$ and $\mathcal{R}_+(-\theta_k')$ land at w_k and w_k' respectively. Recall that $\psi_+(w_k) = \psi_+(w_k')$ by construction. If $\psi_+(w_1) = \psi_+(w_2)$ this means that $\mathcal{B}_R(-\beta)$ also lands at $\psi_+(w_1)$. Since $\alpha < \theta_k < \beta < \theta_k' < \alpha'$, it follows that the finite (closed) bubble rays $\mathcal{B}_R(-\theta_k)$ and $\mathcal{B}_R(-\theta_k')$ enclose a closed region where $\mathcal{B}_R(-\beta)$ is trapped inside. So the only possibility that $\mathcal{B}_R(-\beta)$ lands at $\psi_+(w_1)$ is that $\psi_+(w_1) = \psi_+(w_k) = \psi_+(w_k')$, which is impossible by Lemma 4.5, since w_k and w_k' are pre-images of p_α. Hence $z_1 = z_2$ and we are done.

Case 2. $j = 1, k = 2$ Again, the implication $z \sim_r w$ implies $\psi_1(w) = \psi_2(z)$ follows automatically from the construction.

Let us therefore assume $\psi_c(w) = \psi_+(z)$, and not $z \sim_r w$. But then there are rays $\mathcal{R}_c(t)$ landing at z and $\mathcal{R}_+(s)$ landing at w such that $\psi_+(-t)$ lands at some $w' \neq w$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(-s)$ lands at some $z' \neq z$ (otherwise $z \sim_r w$). But then $\psi_+(w) = \psi_+(w')$ and we can apply Case 1.

Case 3. $j = k = 2$. Again, if $z_1 \sim_r z_2$ then $\psi_c(z_1) = \psi_c(z_2)$ follows from the construction.

Suppose now that $\psi_c(z_1) = \psi_c(z_2)$. We have to prove that $z_1 \sim_r z_2$. Suppose z_1 and z_2 are not ray equivalent. Then there are rays $\mathcal{R}_c(t_j)$ landing at z_j, $j = 1, 2$ such that the rays $\mathcal{R}_+(-t_j)$ land at two different points w_1 and w_2. But then $\psi_+(w_1) = \psi_+(w_2)$ so we can apply Case 1 again. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

References

[1] Magnus Aspenberg and Pascale Roesch. Newton maps as matings of cubic polynomials. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 113:77–112, 2016 (1).
[2] Magnus Aspenberg and Michael Yampolsky. Mating non-renormalisable quadratic polynomials. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 287(1):1–40, 2009.
[3] Dimitry Dudko. Matings with laminations. Preprint, arXiv: 1112.4780.
[4] Lars Pedersen. An analysis of a shared mating in V_2. Master Thesis, Umeå University, 2014.
[5] Mitsuhiro Shishikura. On a theorem of M. Rees for matings of polynomials. In *The Mandelbrot set, theme and variations*, volume 274 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 289–305. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000.
[6] Lei Tan. Matings of quadratic polynomials. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 12(3):589–620, 1992.
[7] Vladlen Timorin. The external boundary of M. In *Holomorphic Dynamics and Renormalization: A Volume in Honour of John Milnor's 75th Birthday*, volume 53 of *Fields Institute Communicatios*, pages 225–268. AMS and the Fields Institute, 2008.

E-mail address: magnusa@maths.lth.se

Lund University, Center for Mathematical Sciences, Box 118, 221 00 Lund, Sweden.